1	
2	
3	
4	
5	CLARK, LINCOLN, AND WHITE PINE COUNTIES
6	GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
7	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
8	SCOPING MEETING
9	
10	
11	
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13	
14	On Tuesday, August 2, 2011
15	At 5:00 p.m.
16	
17	At the Pioche Elementary School
18	651 Airport Road
19	Pioche, Nevada
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Reported by: Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR

KATHY HIATT: P.O. Box 146, Pioche, Nevada 89043. We have a ranch that's 16 miles east of Pony Springs. It's on the Atlanta Mine Road. And in the summer when Lake Valley turns all of their pumps on to water their fields, we literally have to, we call it chumming our windmill to get water into our house. We have to turn the water out of the creek onto the fields above the windmill and let it run for quite some time before we can turn our windmill on and pump our water to our holding tank for our house. And that's just Lake Valley using the normal water for their big pivots and stuff.

2.2

So if they put that pipeline in and took the water, we would probably have nothing at our ranch.

And we're like 7200 feet and we are probably a good, well, 13 miles from where all of the agricultural is going on with the fields there in Lake Valley.

I believe that if they put that pipeline in, we would have no water. And the thing about the renewable groundwater, I'm not sure where that renewable water is supposed to come from, because once it's pumped out of there, it's going to be gone. If we have a good winter and a lot of, you know, water in the spring, we don't have as much of a problem, but at this point it's already affecting us

with just them using the water.

1.3

2.2

So if that water is taken out of here, it's going to affect a lot of people. I mean, it would affect us even our drinking water, not just to water our fields and stuff but our drinking water. And it's the John D. and Kathleen Kohl ranch that I'm talking about that's affected, but we've been on that five generations. We've been on there several hundred years, and we've not had the problems we are experiencing now.

GARY ELMER: Post Office Box 281, Panaca,
Nevada 89042. I oppose this project on a personal
basis. But I'm a member of our Panaca Town Board.
Southwest Water people came to our meeting, made a
presentation a couple of years ago, and I asked one
of the gentlemen that was there, Why build this one?
You could build a pipeline to the ocean, you know,
and distill water and bring the water needs to Vegas,
and he said, That is planned in the future.

So that makes me believe that this project, they might as well take all the money and build a pipeline to the ocean and distill water and bring it to Vegas. That's my personal opinion. They get all the water they need, unlimited supply there.

MICK LLOYD: HC 74 Box 190, Pioche, 89043.

I also own the Meloy Springs Ranch in the north end of Dry Lake Valley. I've got a really good spring on my property. We run cattle there. We also have a family outfitters business that we operate out of the ranch also.

2.2

And my main concern, biggest concern is with this pipeline project is it will, you know, construction, even before they start pumping the water, the construction and everything, the environmental issues: The wildlife, wild horses.

You know, eventually I feel that once this project is completed and they start pumping water, that, you know, all your surface water is going to dry up and the springs are not going to be available.

You're going to lose your vegetation in those three valleys: Cave Valley, Dry Lake and Delamar, also up in Spring Valley. And it could completely devastate the wildlife and our way of living here in Lincoln County.

And I hope that the BLM really looks at these issues. And my hope is that the right-of-way is not granted until more scientific evidence shows that the water is available for the project that they're looking at in Southern Nevada, in the Las Vegas Valley I should say.

PAT GLOECKNER: HC 74 Box 237, Pioche,
Nevada 89043. Starting off, I was born and raised in
Lincoln County, married into a ranching family. That
family has been here for well over 130, 40 years,
settled the country.

1.3

2.2

operations. We run our cows there five months out of the year. Without that valley, the operations are no more. We have springs over there: Simpson Spring, Fairview Spring. It's a major concern for us when they're low, impacted by any kind of deep well drilling anywhere near there. We're hoping the BLM will not accept SNWA's right-of-way for the pipeline.

RONDA HORNBECK: HC 74 Box 200, Pioche, 89043. My concerns with actually having Southern Nevada Water Authority come in and take the water out of the basins in Lincoln and White Pine counties is the fact that once they take the water, and it starts to take the wells down and take the springs down, even though they've promised to stop pumping water, where is that guarantee?

I don't think and feel that they can actually get that accomplished. I don't want them to take the water in the first place, but I think that it's an outright lie on their part to say that they

will stop pumping if they affect the water rights.

1.3

2.2

Now in Eagle Valley, where I live, the Eagle Valley Irrigation Company had the water appropriated to them that comes out of all the springs out of Mount Wilson, and that's called the headwaters. From the headwaters all the way down through Eagle Valley, Rose Valley, Round Valley, and that water goes on down and does drain into Lake Mead. But all the waters from the headwaters were appropriated through the state water engineer for the Eagle Valley Irrigation Company. We have the right to use those.

Those waters come into what's known as Eagle Valley Reservoir and then the water users down below that in Eagle Valley use those waters. That's our livelihood, has been since Eagle Valley was settled in 1886. And if those springs go dry, it will put all of those families out of business. There are 50 families in Eagle Valley right now, not all of them are on water rights, but those who are on water rights feed cattle, they raise hay, they sell hay or use it for their own cattle operation.

How would Southern Nevada Water Authority mitigate that if those springs were affected? If those springs dried up, there is no way for them to mitigate that entire valley to keep the growth going

that's out there right now, growth being in the pastures, the stock waters, feeding the stock.

2.2

And my concern runs deep and it runs through a lot of years, because our ancestors have taken very good care of those areas. I also, where I worked as a county commissioner, I have concerns that all of the permits would be met through Southern Nevada Water Authority. I have concerns that their promise of turning off the water will not be met. I have concerns of them coming in and utilizing the water that is under White Pine and Lincoln County to supply Clark County until that water is not there any longer, then there will be no more supply for Clark County and it will have already done destruction for Lincoln County and White Pine.

I have a problem in that this proposal is inconsistent with state and local laws. I think that needs to be addressed. I think that anybody who comes in and says they're going to do a project needs to be able to pay for that. I don't think Southern Nevada Water Authority is in the position to pay for everything that they are talking about in this EIS.

I think there will be serious environmental consequences in everything that they do with this pipeline. I feel that as we go forward with -- as

they go forward with their plans, there's so many things they haven't worked out that they haven't addressed that they haven't an idea of what the impacts are, and I don't think that there are any guarantees out there of what the impacts are going to be; and I think it will just be a travesty to have this move forward and have the water taken out of these two counties to supply the water to another county.

1.3

2.2

I just have serious concerns over how they would ever mitigate for the losses that I feel that we're going to have, because even though they've gone out and done their studies, their studies are showing there will be impacts.

In Las Vegas on their wells, they've pumped enough that the ground is starting to shrink in in places and they're not putting that out there. If it's doing it in their own county, why in the world would it not do it for somebody else's county when they're going in and taking the water? It's a proven item to them; they're disregarding it.

The ground is shrinking, collapsing because the water is not there anymore and the ground collapses in around itself; there's a depression in the ground. They know it. They're going to do the

same thing to our two counties and that's wrong.

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Let me explain a couple of things to you very, very quickly, if I can. What we've attempted to set up tonight is an opportunity for you to talk one-on-one with the experts that know the substance of this project. And those folks are going to be wandering around most of the night, so if you've got questions that you need answers to or want answers to, just look for somebody that's wearing one of these name tags and they'll be happy to have that conversation with you.

But what we are going to do now is give you an opportunity to make whatever formal statement you'd like to make about this project for the record.

First of all, if you didn't get one when you came in, we have this sheet that's labeled Frequently Asked Questions. It is a synopsis in ten pages of what this is all about. We've written it as simply as we can make it. We've made it as straightforward as we hope we can and hopefully it's going to tell you most of what you need to know.

If you have an interest in getting a full copy of the entire environmental impact study, which is a lot of paper, if you can image, or a copy of the big executive summary, which is still about a hundred

pages, we'd like you to fill out one of these labels back at the table when you first came in, self address this thing, simply put your name on it and we'll make sure that you get one.

2.2

If you would like to make a statement tonight and you would like to have it recorded formally by the court reporter, please fill out one of these speaker cards. We have about five people that have signed up.

If you've got a comment that you'd like to make and would like to do so but wouldn't like to do so verbally and would like to do it in private and write it down, please fill out one of these comment forms. You can leave it with us tonight, you can take it with you, send it in any time. If you want to take two or three of these things for your friends, neighbors, feel free to. If you want to make copies, go ahead, feel free to do that as well.

So we have only at the moment about five people that have signed up to speak. When those folks are done, the rest of these people will be sticking around for a while so we'll be happy to sit down and talk to you about specifics of this project.

That's about it. And at this point I'd like to introduce our public hearing officer tonight,

Dr. Michael Dwyer, who will explain how this is going to work.

2.2

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the formal hearing part of this meeting. The purpose of this hearing is to hear your comments on the Clark, Lincoln and White Pine Counties Groundwater Development Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This document was prepared by the BLM with the help of AECOM, a consulting firm, AECOM, and it was prepared in response to an application we received from the Southern Nevada Water Authority in August of 2004 for rights-of-way across BLM land for a facility for the purpose of transporting groundwater.

Let me be clear that at this point no decision has been made by the BLM on this application. The National Environmental Policy Act requires BLM to document and take into consideration the impacts of this project before that decision is made.

The final version of the draft environmental impact statement that you have in your hands will be the vehicle for documenting and presenting those impacts of this project to the decision maker. This hearing is your opportunity to help us make this EIS

as clear, comprehensive and accurate as it can be.

1.3

2.2

Several alternatives, including the No Action alternative, are analyzed in this document.

The No Action alternative simply describes the impact if the BLM were to reject this application and continue with current land uses.

Let me clarify what this hearing is not.

First it is not about the allocation of water rights.

That is not a BLM decision. That decision belongs to the State of Nevada, and specifically the Nevada state engineer, who will conduct separate public hearings this fall before rendering a decision on the Southern Nevada Water Authority's application for water rights.

Second it's not a debate. The first part of this meeting tonight was designed to answer your questions, and that's why we had the posters and the specialists here. This part of the meeting is about listening to you. It's a formal public hearing in which each person who wants to make comments orally in a public forum will be given the opportunity to do so.

Your comments and questions will be captured by our court reporter and will be addressed in writing in the final environmental impact statement.

Please be aware that if you ask a question while you're at the podium, we will note it in the record and address it in the final EIS, but we will not respond during the hearing. If you have a question that you'd like to have answered, you're very welcome to stand up, go to the back of the room, seek out a BLM person or one of the AECOM folks and go out in the hall and get your question answered.

2.2

We want to hear from everyone who has something to say tonight. We have the room until 8:00 o'clock. I don't think that's going to be a problem since we only have five people signed up. If you haven't signed up and you want to speak, please feel free once the five are finished to do so.

We are giving everyone about five minutes, if you can keep it brief, and we have some placards up here to give you an idea of how much time you have left. I don't think that's going to be a big issue here, so if you need more than that, keep it reasonable, that should be fine.

You should also know that written comments will be accepted tonight and they carry just as much weight as the verbal testimony. So if you don't feel like standing up, you're very welcome to submit comments in written form, either tonight or before

the deadline. The deadline has just been extended to October 11th of 2011.

1.3

2.2

Regarding audience participation, please treat the speaker as you would like to be treated when it's your turn at the podium. Please don't interrupt the speaker, and please note that audience comments and reactions will not be part of the transcript.

Finally, let me explain what happens from this point forward. The comments you make here tonight, along with all the comments that are made at other public meetings and those submitted in writing, will be used to develop a final version of this environmental impact statement. We expect to have this document available to the public in mid 2012. It will include a comment response document that explains the disposition of all the comments we received.

When the final EIS is ready for release, a notice of availability will be published in the Federal Register as well as in local newspapers and it will be posted on the BLM website. A decision on the application can be rendered any time 30 days after that notice of availability is published; and a formal record of decision will be published and

posted when the decision is made.

2.2

With that I'd like to extend my sincere thanks to all of you for your willingness to participate in this process. I've worked on many environmental impact statements during my 31 years with the BLM and it's my experience they're always much better in the end for vigorous public involvement and public comment.

So what I'd like to do is now call this hearing to order and ask John, who introduced me, our moderator tonight, to call the first speaker.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: I'm going to introduce the speakers in the approximate order that I think we received these but we always give deference to elected officials if they would like to speak first.

Is George Rowe here? Mr. Rowe, would you like to speak first? And when you come up, if I could ask you please to state your name and your address for the court reporter, I would appreciate that. Thanks.

GEORGE T. ROWE: Okay. My name is George T.

Rowe. People call me Tommy here in Lincoln County.

I am the chairman of the Lincoln County Commission
and I am senior member on the Lincoln County Water

District. I'm here to speak tonight in my capacity as a lifetime resident of Lincoln County and not as a public official.

2.2

First of all, I think that this pipeline will be the ruination of the northern counties that's being affected. I think that you cannot run a pipeline through an area without messing up all of the feed for the cattle, the white sage that grows in the flatland in the valleys where this primary is for the pipeline.

Alaska where the tundra would grow back, everything would be fine, the antelope or the animals can migrate in their normal ways after the pipeline was done, and everything looks normal afterwards in a year or two it would be great, but that's not going to be happening when you take and put a big scar like this across our desert.

Not to mention the drawdown that the water would have on our springs and everything else. And as you can see, I didn't bring a prepared speech tonight, I just want you people to know my feelings.

And I would encourage you to use good science before you make a decision on this pipeline because it will ruin it for the folks of Lincoln and

1 White Pine counties. Thank you.

2.2

THE REPORTER: Mr. Rowe, would you like to state your address for the record?

GEORGE T. ROWE: My address is Post Office Box 63, Caliente, Nevada 89008.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Bevan Lister.

Mr. Lister, if you would spell your name and give

your address please.

BEVAN LISTER: Thank you. For the record Bevan Lister, B-e-v-a-n, L-i-s-t-e-r, P.O. Box 124, Pioche, Nevada 89043.

I'm just a local fellow, farmed a little bit, ranched a little bit. In looking through what we've seen here tonight, there's a few things missing. In the economic impacts I think it's absolutely essential that we have a full description of how much money Harry Reid is going to make from this project, whether him or his family or his business associates, either from the water pipeline and water selling and distribution or from the associated power line use. I think that's extremely vital to the knowledge and information that needs to go into the decision making process.

Also in the economics there was missing, and I visited with some of your folks about it, an evaluation of how this is going to affect domestic well owners. As groundwater tables diminish, it will affect, yes, irrigators and livestock operators, but there are a large number of our citizens that live on domestic wells, usually in the shallow part of the aquifer. And if those aquifers are affected by deep water pumping, it will cause a tremendous impact to those households, because a farm can, once it reaches the feasibility level, they can shut the water off, quit farming. You got a house and a bunch of kids, you've got to have water. And if you have to drill deeper, drill a new well, buy bigger pumps, run higher power bills, there's a tremendous impact on the economy of the household.

2.2

There also needs to be a thorough discussion of how this affects the future growth of possibilities for the county. There is some mention of it but we don't see in real numbers what the potential loss here would be for this pipeline to go into place. It would not only affect the livestock operators and their futures, but the moving of a hundred thousand acre feet of water out of northern Lincoln and southern White Pine counties basically affects from -- I'm a farmer. So 25,000 acres of production agriculture or current values, 25 to \$50

million a year of economic benefit to rural communities. And I think that that's something that needs to be thoroughly discussed and evaluated.

2.2

And then last but not least, it's very important for you and the folks that are here that you put right in writing right up front that this whole NEPA process is just completely moot. It means nothing. The BLM has no choice. The act passed by Congress simply says not withstanding the NEPA process, this right-of-way is in effect. That's what the law says.

Yeah, it's a great dog and pony show and, yeah, hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent on analysis and evaluations and contractors and consultants, and we put on a good show around the country, but I think it needs to state the law right there in the front part of the book that says that's all it is is for show, because the decision has already been made. Thank you, Mr. Harry.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Connie Simkins. If you would please spell your last name and give us your address.

CONNIE SIMKINS: Connie Simkins,

S-i-m-k-i-n-s, Post Office Box 333, Panaca, Nevada.

I'm a 67 year resident of this community.

The right-of-way application we're talking about tonight by the Southern Nevada Water Authority should be denied by the BLM for two substantial reasons. Both of them come from BLM rules. First, to comply with the BLM's own guidance entitled Obtaining a Right-of-Way on Public Land from the Lands and Realty Division dated March 10th, 2009, specifically pages 10 and 11 that says a right-of-way application can be denied for any of these six reasons. And I think in part and for some of the rest of them you could use each one of these six reasons:

2.2

The application does not conform to land use plans; would not be in the public interest; the applicant is not qualified based on the fact of the input that they've given to this document; proposal is inconsistent with federal, state and local laws; the applicant is not technically capable of performing this project; and finally there are a series of environmental consequences that may occur that cannot be mitigated.

The second major reason you should deny this application is found in this EIS draft proposal discussion tonight. I seriously urge the BLM to listen to their own analysis contained in the four

pages of chapter four that discusses irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources. There are 22 topics given including air, geology, water, soil, vegetation, wildlife, aquatic biological, minerals, rangeland, horses, land uses, special designations, recreation, transportation, visual resources, cultural, Native American values, socioeconomics, environmental justice, hazardous materials, surface disturbance, and groundwater pumping.

2.2

Let's talk a minute about cumulative impacts. We are starting to see them today. Take the online transmission project that's now undergoing in Jake's Valley in White Pine County and is scheduled to move through Muleshoe and Dry Lake Valley and Delamar Valley down into Clark County. The public lands are now having trouble with roads, gates being left open.

This document talks about you cannot describe the cumulative impacts until the projects are built. This statement is false. We see these impacts today on just the very first of five projects that are listed in section 3.12 executive summary page 33 and 34. Three of these five projects have not started. They've not met with the County, the general public. They haven't told us what's going

on.

2.2

And they haven't even discussed the pending right-of-way Yucca rail application, which the BLM has declined Lincoln County request to cancel this application. They said they're going to take no action until Congress decides that they're going to fund Yucca Mountain.

Again in section 3.12 page 37 they talk about only one percent of the 1.56 million acres in forage will not be lost. Only one percent of that. Well, I tell you, if you take half of Gloeckner's allotment, that's a heck of a lot more than one percent. You could take a cut in pay for one percent, I couldn't. Any of us in this room couldn't. But if you cut off half of everything, if you take Gloeckner's allotment, they won't have any winter range. You couldn't survive without half of your job, you'd have to go get a second job, as we all would. So this cumulative impact, this loss of forage statement in this document is inaccurate.

They talk about long-term draw in section

4.3 page 43. You have a nice little colored graph.

And the place that is most heavily impacted is a big red splotch. I want to enter these pictures into the record. Let the record show that they're pictures of

a small 16 acre sub-irrigated pasture that I own in Panaca, Nevada. I have personal knowledge of the water flows and the dryness and the wetness of this piece of property for the past 47 years.

2.2

In the spring this land is too wet to get my tractor on to do work. As soon as the farmers start turning their -- as soon as the farmers turn on their sprinklers, my pasture gets so dry I have to haul water to my cows. But as soon as they turn their pumps off in September, my water table comes back up.

If this project pumps water from groundwater basins around me, I'm sure my field will be absolutely worthless. And I'm just a minor player in this thing. Most of the people that are involved in this valley have much more land than I do and have much more invested. It's a small thing.

Additions and improvements to this document must include all the things that are listed, including placing cattle guards at every fence, road crossing, allotment boundary fences; using type II gravel, full-time onsite road maintenance equipment, plus fire suppression and dust control equipment.

These are the mistakes that were made by the NV Energy people that are not in the stipulations that BLM wrote, so we're having a real problem with the

online people in White Pine County and we don't want it to continue in Lincoln County, so we need to get this straightened out right here right now.

1.3

2.2

We must create success standards for adaptive re-vegetation mitigation before any construction work is authorized. These standards must assure no net losses of AUMs.

The long-term pumping effects and the drawdown on page 61, they say there's no current pumping in Cave Valley, Dry Lake Valley and Delamar Valley. This is incorrect. It has been scientifically proven that these water basins are interconnected and will affect each other.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Ms. Simkins, excuse me, your five minutes are up.

CONNIE SIMKINS: Okay. I've got one more paragraph.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Okay.

CONNIE SIMKINS: The impacts of this project are unpredictable and uncontrollable. This application is incomplete and insufficient. I believe the Las Vegas Valley Water district, and yes, I'm old enough to remember when it was the Las Vegas Valley Water District before it became Southern Nevada Water Authority, has designed this project

under the misconception that they are too big to fail. That is the very reason the BLM should deny this right-of-way application because it is too big.

2.2

I will steal a quotation from White Pine
County Commission Chairman Laurie Carson. Our water
is finite. We are the stewards of these resources
and we've taken darn good care of them up until now.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Miss Simkins, if you have a written statement, if you wouldn't mind, you can certainly leave it with the court reporter; we can make sure that we've got all the details in there.

CONNIE SIMKINS: I did that.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Louis Benezet. If you would please spell your last name and give us your address.

LOUIE BENEZET: I'm Louie Benezet,
B-e-n-e-z-e-t. Address near Pioche, Prince Mine.

I would hope that I'd have a chance to study your document in depth but my computer couldn't handle the disk. And the library computer crashed when I stuck them in there and so I went down to the BLM and spent the day down there looking at their copy, which they were kind enough to show me. And after a couple hours of that, I found I was pretty

much incapable of thinking.

1.3

2.2

But I was impressed by the document. I just want to thank you guys for the work that you've done. I think that considering what could have been done, it is really quite a resource, especially in covering some of the things that I'm interested in, such as the issues of regional water drawdown and the cumulative impacts of the SNWA pipeline and the other things that have been proposed and have been happening.

With that said, there are a few things that I would comment on that I think that might be useful. Cumulative impacts I guess -- my notes here are pretty scattered so if I take things out of order -- cumulative impacts, as Connie said, they're already going on and they have been going on actually for 20 years.

Cumulative impacts started, Southern Nevada
Water Authority, Las Vegas Valley Water District
filed an application for all the water in these three
counties. The minute that happened, water became a
commodity like gold, and a lot of things have
developed from that.

The promise of a pipeline coming north through this vast area of Great Basin is similar to

the concept of the first transcontinental railroad back in 1860. You see towns spring up because of the speculators going out and saying, you know, the railroad is going to come here, come buy lots and I'll sell them to you. You see other areas not fortunate enough to get the railroad, and the town that might have had promise dries up.

2.2

The pipeline has this kind of an impact.

It's kind of hard to assess it but I think it's one of the most important things about this project. And perhaps it falls under the final one of the later categories in your document under socioeconomic impacts. I think that there are additional things that need to go into that section of your document.

happened that are related to the pipeline. The pipeline application was filed in 1989. In 1998 Lincoln County formed a partnership with the Vidler water company. Vidler came to Lincoln County and persuaded the County that they could not prevent the pipeline, which is what they wanted to do, but if they joined forces with Vidler, they could come up with a plan to protect their water; however, in the short period of time, all the County's efforts were directed towards water development, very much like

what's going on in Las Vegas, exporting water through the valleys here to valleys, uninhabited valleys south of the county near the county line, Coyote Springs near Mesquite over at Toquop.

2.2

1989 going to 1998 coincidentally was about the same time that Harvey Whittemore bought Coyote Springs. It was in a three way deal with the Southern Nevada Water Authority where he didn't have to pay anything by turning over some of the water. Toquop also developed about that time. One of the developers down in Mesquite trespassing on BLM and persuaded the County to front door them to see if they could get some legislation to buy it.

In 2003 you have the agreement with SNWA. This was prompted pretty much by Vidler wanting to clear the way so they could deal whatever water projects down to the Mesquite area because SNWA protested some of them.

So you see all of these things that fall in the process that originated from the pipeline idea itself and from the creation of rural water as a commodity. Following that in 2004 you had the Land Act proposal, and at that time we had SNWA up here lobbying people to support the Lincoln County Land Act and telling us that we needn't worry about

whether or not the provision for a right-of-way preempted NEPA because NEPA would still be in effect and all that stuff would go forward. We've already heard a comment tonight of the disappointment that the question of whether or not to grant a right-of-way with Lincoln County area has already been preempted.

2.2

Then in 2006 approximately we had Harvey Whittemore of Coyote Springs coming up here and purchasing essentially all the land and water he could get and putting together a portfolio of some 35,000 acre feet of water which he would then identify as being exported to Coyote Springs in his EIS for the Coyote Springs development, and the pipeline of course. Without the pipeline you don't transfer that water.

Now economic changes over the last few years may have changed some of these sales, I don't know.

I've heard rumors. It doesn't matter because I'm not talking about specifics here, I'm not talking about a particular developer, I'm talking about the effect that it's had on the County to have this pipeline phantom, or whatever you want to call it, hanging over us.

That's changed the way our future is already

being created. It's changed our leadership because the money that's come from the developers has been pumped back into creating administrative departments in the County to deal with the developers, and we have people that have a lot of influence very close to the lives of developers now and don't talk to the citizens as much.

1.3

2.2

that the County is for the pipeline. And this is kind of unfortunate. When the applications were made by Whittemore to transfer the water from Lake Valley, I proposed, before I went to the state engineer I sat in front of the post office with a petition. I had two because the SNWA application first to go through on Delamar Dry Lake and Cave Valley was happening about that time, 2008, and so I had two petitions. I had one protesting SNWA and the other one protesting Harvey's water transfer.

And then I had a friend circulate the same petition in Alamo and Caliente. All together we got 660 signatures. And sitting in front of the post office in Pioche, not a single person disagreed with my petition. Everybody I asked signed it. So I guess I'll quit with that for now. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Kena Gloeckner. If

you would please, spell your name, give the court reporter your address.

1.3

2.2

KENA LYTLE GLOECKNER: Kena Lytle Gloeckner, K-e-n-a, L-y-t-l-e, G-l-o-e-c-k-n-e-r. HC 74 Box 237, Pioche, Nevada 89043.

In 1845 my great, great grandfather came to this area and began to establish what would become our present day family cattle ranching operation.

Members of the succeeding generations were born on this land, worked hard to earn a living from that land and were laid to rest in the same area of earth that they spent their entire lives. Five generations of extended family lie buried in our small family cemetery and every one of these people loved and respected the land that sustained them.

Dry Lake Valley has provided our family much of the sustenance for more than 100 years since it represents 100 percent of our winter grazing. For five months of the year, November through April, over 1500 head of cattle thrive on the abundant winter fat and on the water supplied from wells and springs as they give birth to their calfs in this more moderate climate. Dry Lake Valley is essential to the existence of several ranch operations. Without it the livelihood of various families would be destroyed

along with the legacy that helped shape the West.

1.3

2.2

After having read your executive summary, I would like to express several concerns applicable to our operation. First of all, on page 37 you write that although 20,570 acres of native vegetation in the basin will be removed by the project, this affects less than one percent of the total area of all cumulative surface disturbance.

You go on to say that no changes in livestock stocking rates would be affected. Because you are dealing with over 1.5 million acres for the total project, you assume that this small portion of land disturbance from the pipeline itself is very minimal. I, however, believe this conclusion is vastly incorrect since any change in available forage or water would have a tremendous domino effect on many livestock operations.

Parts of Cave and most of Dry Lake and
Delamar valleys serve as the only winter grazing
grounds of many operations. Other areas of the
Wilson Creek allotment belonging to ranchers are not
suitable for winter use because of snowfall levels
and cold temperatures. Grazing permittees can only
run as many livestock as the most limiting portion of
their permit. Dry Lake Valley, for example,

represents our most limiting portion.

1.3

2.2

Since the sustainable numbers supported on this winter allotment is, therefore, directly linked to the number of cattle using our summer, spring and fall allotments, these other seasonal areas would also become drastically affected. We would be incapable of running anything close to our current numbers.

Loss of forage, any forage and water in our Dry Lake allotment alone could affect directly 12,163 AUMs, but in addition more than double this amount if spring, summer and fall AUMs are taken into consideration. The economic impact would be drastic since it would be impossible to replace this lost natural winter forage with hay or another desirable grazing area since none are available in our area.

Additionally, the abundant winter fat, also called white sage, areas that exist in Dry Lake,
Delamar and other valleys represents some of the best winter grazing ranges in the state for cattle and sheep. When disturbed, the sensitive plant is easily destroyed and almost impossible to reestablish. In your summary on page 35 you state that the GWD project and each foreseeable project would be required to re-vegetate disturbed surfaces, yet this

plant and several others would be impossible to reestablish.

1.3

2.2

With over 300 miles of disturbance for the pipeline alone, added with the hundreds of miles for laterals to the wells, the soil and vegetation disturbance is unthinkable. Even more distressing is the disturbance to vegetation when the drawdown factor from excessive pumping is added to the equation.

To compound the bleak situation, in this area is found a very finely divided soil composed of dust blown by wind and silt deposited by water.

After any disturbance of the surface crust, it easily becomes airborne again. The area is prone to many dust storms, and this soil type becomes even more troublesome whenever it is disturbed by travel. In fact, the soil in the valley bottom is classified as highly erodible under the Natural Resources

Conservation Service's Highly Erodible Lands identification procedures.

With this type of soil, coupled with lack of sufficient water, I believe it would be very difficult to reestablish vegetation at an adequate level to sustain livestock, wild horses, and wildlife grazing at present levels or anywhere close to that.

As permittees in the Dry Lake Valley, we not only have grazing allotments in this area, but we also own the water rights for the springs and wells that service this valley. Currently we have a pipeline network that is over 31 miles long and that transports water to five reservoirs, in addition to three wells located within the proposed area. These reservoirs also provide water for the wild horse, deer and antelope herds in the valley. Our pipelines run from the mountain springs to all watering areas throughout the valley.

1.3

2.2

What effects will the physical construction of the pipeline and related facilities have on our existing pipelines, wells and reservoirs? Will all the GWD project construction bypass our structures or will they destroy them in the process? Will our pipelines run beneath their pipeline, will they run over the top of their pipeline or will they be eliminated altogether, because they do bisect.

Also will we still have accessibility and serviceability to our water? Most importantly your summary shows that the long range pumping effects will more than likely have drastic impacts on our water rights, and our wells, as you put it, could be rendered unusable.

Minimally there will be a 10 to 20 foot drawdown in a small portion of northern Dry Lake Valley, but in the majority of the area a 20 to 50 drawdown will be likely. Here is where the domino effect emerges again. You must realize that the ensuing consequences for affecting these water rights could prove to be drastic. Again, not only would these particular water rights be affected since ranchers could show no beneficial use by cattle, which the area could no longer sustain, but the water rights in our other grazing areas, we own vested water rights to over 50 other springs in the spring and summer allotments, would be detrimentally affected without the cattle herds to show beneficial use.

1.3

2.2

Currently our entire Wilson Creek allotment contains almost one million acres. Along with losing the water rights to these grazing areas, we would also lose the grazing rights to this vast tract of land. Would Southern Nevada Water Authority, the BLM or the state water engineer then become responsible for reimbursing all ranchers along the GWD project pathway for their extreme losses or would we just lose everything that's taken a lifetime to build?

For over 150 years the ranchers have been

excellent stewards of the land because it, in essence, is their livelihood. The loss of the native plant species and water in this area as a result of the GWD project construction would be irreversible and irreplaceable. Please grant us the opportunity to continue to do our part in using the public lands.

1.3

2.2

Furthermore, there would also be adverse socioeconomic impacts that would occur from this project. The permittees in Dry Lake Valley North are among some of the oldest and largest ranches in Lincoln County and have been in the ranching business for almost 150 years. At the present time we have ten heirs to our ranch who will continue our family's legacy. The concerns and risks related to this project could change our way of life forever. Not only would it destroy our livelihood but it would also greatly affect our quality of life, our valued rural lifestyle and our heritage.

Moreover, Lincoln County is an economically depressed area, and the ranching industry is a vital element to the economy since it represents one of the main commercial activities in the area. The many ranches that exist in the county constitute a major portion of the tax base and use the local businesses for support services. Lincoln County cannot afford

another hit to its already struggling economy.

2.2

These areas of concern merely touch upon the alarming findings published in your executive summary. The detrimental effects that could result from this project could devastate this entire portion of rural Nevada. Since it is your mission to sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations, I urge you to select the No Action alternative and to deny the right-of-way request. Your careful consideration of the concerns expressed would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Glennon Zelch.

Mr. Zelch, if you could spell your name and give us
your address please.

GLENNON ZELCH: My name is Glennon Zelch, G-l-e-n-n-o-n, Z-e-l-c-h. My address is P.O. Box 418, Pioche, Nevada.

And I want to talk about, well, mitigation implies that they know they're going to cause damage. The question is are they financially prepared to reimburse every affected entity in Lincoln and White Pine, southern White Pine counties for the damages they cause or are we going to be up against a million dollars worth of lawyers trying to stall for 40 years

until we die of old age? I suspect that's what we're going to be up against because they're not going to be willing to pay for all of the extra electrical expenses just in deepening wells and pumping water from an additional 50 to a hundred feet deep.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I'm on the board for Pioche Public Utilities here in town. We've got very good water. If we have to deepen our wells, or even if the water table drops 50 feet, we deepen the wells, we still have to lift that water an additional 50 feet. Is Southern Nevada Water Authority going to reimburse us for our costs? That's part of the economic impact, and it absolutely should be required if this project is allowed to go through. And not only for Pioche but every affected entity in the whole area, they should have to make us whole. And they don't have the financial resources to do it. It's going to cause too much damage. And what we're going to be faced with is a whole battery of lawyers trying to stall and get out of it. you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Abby Johnson.

Miss Johnson, if you would spell your name and give us your address please.

ABBY JOHNSON: Abby, A-b-b-y, Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n, P.O. Box 183, Baker, Nevada 89311.

My name is Abby Johnson. I'm on the board of directors for the Great Basin Water Network and I just want to make a few process comments about the hearings and how things are going.

1.3

2.2

First of all, it is encouraging that the BLM decided to add an extra 30 days to the review process but it's not enough. This is a complex, massive document, six years in the making. We think that at least the public should be afforded 180 days to review a document that took that long to prepare.

Secondly, the frequently asked questions and answers that was handed out up front is very helpful but I was told that it won't be available electronically until after these hearings are over.

And I would strongly suggest that if it's going to be used as a guide, as a useful tool for people to be able to get up to speed on this, that it would be more useful if it were available electronically so that people could prepare for a meetings like this rather than read it after the hearings are all over.

As you know, we have prepared this EIS guide. And having done that personally, I know how complex the document is and how challenging it is to take all of that information and focus it on the few things that people can grab onto and relate to. And

so I would encourage you to make this available electronically sooner rather than later.

1.3

2.2

And the third comment I have is on the setup of this. It looks like we're going to be in a lot of gyms over the next three weeks. The acoustics are lacking, as they are in a gym. And the thing that I'm finding is that the speaker is talking to the two of you when all of you really want to hear what the speaker is saying. And I would just make a recommendation, especially for Baker tomorrow night, but for the all of these hearings, for example if you had the podium here and you had your table there, you know, if I were here and you were there (indicating), I could be heard by all of you and by you and it would be a more effective exchange.

I think I'm just going to leave it at the process comments because there's so many more hearings and some many more opportunities in the next 19 days to participate. And thank you very much for your attention.

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: That's our last speaker.

Anybody else like to make a statement?

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Would you please give us your name and address.

PAUL DONOHUE: My name is Paul Donohue,

D-o-n-o-h-u-e, P.O Box 291, Pioche, Nevada 89043.

1.3

2.2

Wanted to listen, support everything that people said but it's interesting. As I sit back I watched the presentation on the computer, you know, and it's zipping up in Las Vegas up there and it gives this wonderful technological view, you know.

And I admire the technology but it made me think a lot after listening to Mrs. Gloeckner, that view from that computer is how we're looking it from 20,000 feet or 5,000 feet and it just makes everything look this small.

But when you hear from the people who are stewards of the land, it's their lives and their calves, that little white sagebrush that that cow is eating, I just encourage you to lower your view, get right down into it and take a good look at the effects and don't look at it from 20,000 feet. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Would anyone else like to make a comment publicly? If not, we will be here for another hour. If you have a comment that you'd like to make privately to the court reporter, please feel free to do so. And the rest of the folks that are here working on this particular project will be around for the next hour so please feel free to

1 stay around and we'll be happy to talk to you. 2 Just basically wanted to say LOUIS BENEZET: 3 that as a couple other people mentioned today I feel 4 that the only alternative really is the No Action 5 alternative. 6 And to follow up on a remark that Connie 7 Simkins made, referring to chapter four of the 8 irreversible commitment of resources, I believe 9 that's the title of the chapter, I wrote down a 10 quote. The permanent extraction of groundwater in 11 Evidence by formation of regionally 12 extensive drawdown cones is an irretrievable commitment of resources. And I think that sentence 13 14 pretty well sums up the main problem. In other 15 words, the drawdown is regional in nature. 16 (Thereupon the proceedings 17 were concluded at 7:19 p.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 2.3 24 25

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF NEVADA)
3	SS:
4	COUNTY OF NYE)
5	I, Deborah Ann Hines, certified court
6	reporter, do hereby certify that I took down in
7	shorthand (Stenotype) all of the proceedings had in
8	the before-entitled matter at the time and place
9	indicated; and that thereafter said shorthand notes
10	were transcribed into typewriting at and under my
11	direction and supervision and the foregoing
12	transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate
13	record of the proceedings had.
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed
15	my hand this 14th day of September, 2011.
16	
17	
18	
19	Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	